arXiv:0910.2880v4 [hep-th] 15 Jul 2010

arXiv: 0910.2880 [hep-th]
CAS-PHYS-BHU Preprint

Rigid rotor as a toy model for Hodge theory

Saurabh Gupta$^{(a)}$, **R. P. Malik**$^{(a,b)}$
$^{(a)}$*Physics Department, Centre of Advanced Studies,*
Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi - 221 005, (U.P.), India
and
$^{(b)}$*DST Centre for Interdisciplinary Mathematical Sciences,*
Faculty of Science, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi - 221 005, India
e-mails: guptasaurabh4u@gmail.com, malik@bhu.ac.in

Abstract: We apply the superfield approach to the toy model of a rigid rotor and show the existence of the nilpotent and absolutely anticommuting Becchi-Rouet-Stora-Tyutin (BRST) and anti-BRST symmetry transformations, under which, the kinetic term and the action remain invariant. Furthermore, we also derive the off-shell nilpotent and absolutely anticommuting (anti-) co-BRST symmetry transformations, under which, the gauge-fixing term and the Lagrangian remain invariant. The anticommutator of the above nilpotent symmetry transformations leads to the derivation of a bosonic symmetry transformation, under which, the ghost terms and the action remain invariant. Together, the above transformations (and their corresponding generators) respect an algebra that turns out to be a physical realization of the algebra obeyed by the de Rham cohomological operators of differential geometry. Thus, our present model is a toy model for the Hodge theory.

PACS: 11.15.-q; 03.70.+k

Keywords: Rigid rotor; (anti-) BRST and (anti-) co-BRST symmetries; superfield formalism; geometrical interpretations; generators and their algebra; de Rham cohomological operators; Hodge theory

1. Introduction

The model of a rigid rotor, over the centuries, has played a pivotal role in providing the key theoretical insights into the dynamics of the classical as well as quantum systems. In particular, in the realm of atomic, molecular and nuclear physics, the contribution of the model of a rigid rotor has been enormous (as far as deep understanding of many physical phenomena is concerned). In our present investigation, we show that the above model presents a tractable toy model for the Hodge theory where the symmetry transformations (and their corresponding generators) provide a physical realization of the de Rham cohomological operators of differential geometry.

In our present endeavor, we begin with an *appropriate* first-order Lagrangian (FOL) for a particle of mass $m = 1$ that is constrained to move on a circle of radius a (i.e. the model of a rigid rotor). This Lagrangian is given below[1] (see, e.g. [1] for a detailed discussion on its appropriateness)

$$L_f = p_r\, \dot r + p_\theta\, \dot\theta - \frac{p_\theta^2}{2r^2} + \lambda\, (r - a), \tag{1}$$

where r and θ are the polar coordinates, $\dot r = (dr/dt), \dot\theta = (d\theta/dt)$ are the generalized velocities, p_r and p_θ are the corresponding canonical momenta and λ is the Lagrange multiplier. All these variables are function of the evolution parameter t. It can be seen that $\Pi_\lambda \approx 0$ and $(r - a) \approx 0$ are the two first-class constraints of the theory [1] where Π_λ is the momentum corresponding to the Lagrange multiplier variable λ. The existence of the first-class constraint, as is well-known [2,3], is the signature of a gauge theory. In fact, the following infinitesimal local gauge transformations (δ_g) [1]

$$\delta_g p_r = f(t), \qquad \delta_g \lambda = \dot f(t), \qquad \delta_g r = \delta_g \theta = \delta_g p_\theta = 0, \tag{2}$$

are generated by the above first-class constraints, under which, we can verify that the FOL transforms (with the infinitesimal gauge parameter $f(t)$) as

$$\delta_g L_f \;=\; \frac{d}{dt}\Big(f(t)\; \big[r(t) - a\big]\Big). \tag{3}$$

Thus, the action $S = \int (dt\; L_f)$, corresponding to above Lagrangian, remains invariant under the infinitesimal local gauge symmetry transformations (2). The conserved charge, that emerges from the above symmetry transformations (due to the Noether's theorem), is nothing but the constraint $(r - a)$.

One of the most intuitive approaches to quantize a gauge theory is the Becchi-Rouet-Stora-Tyutin (BRST) formalism where the gauge parameter is replaced by (anti-) ghost fields. We take up the Lagrangian (1) and demonstrate, in our present paper, that its (anti-) BRST invariant version (cf. (4) below) is endowed with a set of six continuous symmetry transformations which act infinitesimally on the variables of the theory. In fact, we shall establish that the algebra of the continuous symmetry operators is exactly same as the algebra obeyed by the cohomological operators of differential geometry. We also demonstrate that the latter algebra is respected by the conserved charges that generate the above continuous symmetry transformations. Thus, we prove that the rigid rotor is a toy model for the Hodge theory where all the cohomological operators of differential geometry are identified with the continuous symmetries and their corresponding generators.

---

[1] We slightly differ from the FOL of [1] for the sake of brevity and algebraic convenience.

A couple of mathematical properties, that are associated with the key concepts of BRST formalism, are the nilpotency and the absolute anticommutativity of the (anti-) BRST symmetry transformations (and their corresponding generators). The geometrical origin and interpretation of the above properties are provided by the superfield formalism [4,5] where the horizontality condition (HC) plays a decisive role. The latter condition (i.e. (HC)) physically implies that the curvature tensor of a given gauge theory is unaffected by the presence of the Grassmannian variables invoked in the superfield description of the BRST formalism [4,5]. The (anti-) BRST transformations, for the gauge field and (anti-) ghost fields, are determined by utilizing the HC within the framework of superfield formalism. The components of the "gauge" potential of the rigid rotor possess some unusual properties. For instance, the components of this potential transform in a completely different manner (cf. (2),(5),(6)). To obtain such type of unusual transformations, within the framework of the superfield formulation, is a challenging problem for us. We have accomplished this goal of obtaining the (anti-) BRST transformations for the "gauge" components and (anti-) ghost variables of the rigid rotor by making some specific choices in the application of the HC.

The main motivations for carrying out our present investigations are as follows. First, we have already proposed, in our earlier works [6-10], the *field theoretic* models for the Hodge theory in the case of 2D (non-) Abelian 1-form and 4D Abelian 2-form gauge theories. Thus, it is an interesting task for us to propose a *simple* toy model for the Hodge theory where there are almost no mathematical complications and the continuous symmetry transformations of the theory are found to be completely transparent. Second, for the present toy model, the components of the "gauge" potential transform in a completely different manner (see, e.g. [1]). It is, therefore, an interesting endeavor to exploit the superfield formalism to obtain such kind of symmetries within its geometrical framework. Finally, a new model for the Hodge theory is always an exciting development because its proof requires a variety of continuous symmetry transformations. The ensuing operator algebra of the above continuous symmetry transformations turns out to be reminiscent of the algebra obeyed by the de Rham cohomological operators of differential geometry. In other words, we establish a *perfect* analogy between some aspects of mathematics of the differential geometry and the continuous symmetries of the Lagrangian of our present toy model of a rigid rotor.

The contents of our present paper are organized as follows. In section 2, we discuss the off-shell nilpotent and absolutely anticommuting (anti-) BRST symmetry transformations within the frameworks of Lagrangian formalism and superfield approach. This is followed, in section 3, by our discussion about the nilpotent and absolutely anticommuting dual(co)-BRST and anti-co-BRST symmetry transformations in the realm of Lagrangian formulation. Our subsequent section 4 deals with the derivation of a bosonic symmetry transformation. In section 5, we discuss the ghost and discrete symmetry transformations in the theory. We demonstrate, in section 6, the similarity between the algebra of the de Rham cohomological operators and continuous symmetry transformations (and corresponding generators). Finally, we make some concluding remarks and point out a few future directions in section 7.

In our Appendix, we capture some of the key mathematical properties of the (anti-) BRST charges in the superfield formalism.

2. Nilpotent and absolutely anticommuting (anti-)BRST symmetries: two approaches

In this section, we discuss about the off-shell nilpotent (anti-) BRST symmetries in the Lagrangian as well as the superfield formulation. First, in subsection 2.1, we dwell on the completely different type of transformations associated with the components of the "gauge" potential. Later on, in subsection 2.2, we capture these unusual bit of transformations within the framework of the geometrical superfield formalism [4,5] with judicious choices.

2.1 (Anti-) BRST symmetries: Lagrangian description

We begin with the following (anti-) BRST invariant first-order appropriate Lagrangian for the rigid rotor (see, e.g. [1] for details)

$$L_b = p_r\,\dot{r} + p_\theta\,\dot{\theta} - \frac{p_\theta^2}{2r^2} + \lambda\,(r - a) + b\,(\dot{\lambda} - p_r) + \frac{b^2}{2} - i\,\dot{\bar{C}}\,\dot{C} - i\,\bar{C}\,C, \qquad (4)$$

which is the generalization of the first-order gauge-invariant Lagrangian (1). In the above, λ and p_r are the analogues of the components of the "gauge" potential and b is the Nakanishi-Lautrup type auxiliary field that is invoked for the linearization of the gauge-fixing term $[-\frac{1}{2}(\dot{\lambda} - p_r)^2]$. The fermionic (anti-) ghost fields $(\bar{C})C$ are required for the validity of unitarity.

The above FOL respects the following infinitesimal and continuous (anti-) BRST symmetry transformations $s_{(a)b}$ (see, e.g. [1])

$$\begin{aligned} s_{ab}\,\lambda = \dot{\bar{C}}, \quad s_{ab}\,\bar{C} = 0, \quad s_{ab}\,p_r = \bar{C}, \quad s_{ab}\,C = -ib, \\ s_{ab}\,b = 0, \quad s_{ab}\,r = 0, \quad s_{ab}\,\theta = 0, \quad s_{ab}\,p_\theta = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

$$\begin{aligned} s_b\,\lambda = \dot{C}, \quad s_b\,C = 0, \quad s_b\,p_r = C, \quad s_b\,\bar{C} = +ib, \\ s_b\,b = 0, \quad s_b\,r = 0, \quad s_b\,\theta = 0, \quad s_b\,p_\theta = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

It can be seen that the following statements are true, namely;

(i) operator equations $s_b^2 = 0, s_{ab}^2 = 0, s_b s_{ab} + s_{ab} s_b = 0$ are always satisfied,

(ii) out of the two momenta p_r and p_θ, only one of them transforms (i.e. $s_{(a)b} p_r \neq 0, s_{(a)b} p_\theta = 0$) under the (anti-) BRST symmetry transformations,

(iii) the coordinates and their velocities do not transform (i.e. $s_{(a)b} r = s_{(a)b} \theta = 0,\ s_{(a)b} \dot{r} = s_{(a)b} \dot{\theta} = 0$) under the (anti-) BRST transformations. As a result, the kinetic term of the theory remains invariant, and

(iv) the transformation property of λ and p_r are quite different.

The above observations imply that the gauge and (anti-) BRST invariant quantities r, θ, p_θ, etc., are "physical" quantities (in some sense). These comments would play very important roles in our superfield approach to BRST formalism (where we shall derive all the nilpotent and anticommuting (anti-) BRST transformations for the all the variables of the theory).

The conserved and nilpotent (anti-) BRST charges $Q_{(a)b}$, that are the generators of the above (anti-) BRST symmetry transformations, are

$$Q_b = b\,\dot{C} - \dot{b}\,C, \qquad Q_{ab} = b\,\dot{\bar{C}} - \dot{b}\,\bar{C}. \tag{7}$$

Using the following equations of motion

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{r} = b, \qquad \dot{b} = r - a, \qquad \ddot{C} - C = 0, \qquad \ddot{\bar{C}} - \bar{C} = 0, \\ \dot{p}_\theta = 0, \qquad \dot{p}_r = \lambda + r\,\dot{\theta}^2, \qquad p_\theta = r^2\,\dot{\theta}, \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

it is straightforward to check that $\dot{Q}_b = 0,\ \dot{Q}_{ab} = 0$. Furthermore, using the definition of the following canonical momenta

$$\Pi_\lambda = b, \qquad \Pi_C = +i\,\dot{\bar{C}}, \qquad \Pi_{\bar{C}} = -i\,\dot{C}, \qquad \Pi_r = p_r, \qquad \Pi_\theta = p_\theta, \tag{9}$$

and the corresponding canonical brackets (cf. (44) below), it can be checked that the conserved charges obey $Q_b^2 = 0,\ Q_{ab}^2 = 0,\ Q_b Q_{ab} + Q_{ab} Q_b = 0$.

Under the (anti-) BRST symmetry transformations, the kinetic term $p_\theta \dot{\theta} - p_\theta^2/2r^2 \equiv r^2 \dot{\theta}^2/2$ remains invariant because $s_{(a)b}\ r = 0,\ s_{(a)b}\ \theta = 0,\ s_{(a)b}\ p_\theta = 0$. This kinetic term is equivalent to $(v^2/2)$ where $v = r\dot{\theta}$ is the linear velocity. In the language of differential geometry, the kinetic term owes its origin to the exterior derivative $d = dt\ \partial_t$ (with $d^2 = 0$) because $dx = dt\ (\dot{x}) \equiv dt\ (v_x),\ dy = dt\ (\dot{y}) \equiv dt\ (v_y),\ v^2 = v_x^2 + v_y^2$. Thus, the nilpotent (anti-) BRST symmetry transformations can be identified with the exterior derivative. The absolute anticommutativity of the (anti-) BRST transformations, however, imply that only one of them can be identified with the exterior derivative $d = dt\ \partial_t$ (with $d^2 = 0$) of the differential geometry.

We close this subsection with the remark that the physicality condition $Q_{(a)b}|phys >= 0$ leads to the requirement that $b|phys >= 0$ and $\dot{b}|phys >= 0$. These conditions, due to equations (8) and (9), imply that the operator form of the first-class constraints $\Pi_\lambda \approx 0$ and $(r - a) \approx 0$ annihilate the physical states of the theory. Thus, the physicality criteria $Q_{(a)b}|phys >= 0$ is consistent with the Dirac's method of quantization (see, e.g. [3] for details).

2.2 (Anti-) BRST symmetries: superfield formalism

It is evident from our earlier discussions (cf. Introduction) that, out of two polar coordinates, only one is independent coordinate parameter because of the constraint condition $r - a \approx 0$. Thus, effectively, the dynamics of the rotor will be described in terms of the space-time coordinates[2] (r, t). As a consequence, we can define an exterior derivative (see, Sec. 7 below)

$$d = dt\ \partial_t + dr\ \partial_r, \quad dr \wedge dt = - dt \wedge dr, \quad dt \wedge dt = dr \wedge dr = 0. \tag{10}$$

Further, it is clear from the first-class constraints $\Pi_\lambda \approx 0$ and $(r-a) \approx 0$ that the rigid rotor is a model of a gauge theory with gauge potentials represented by variables λ and p_r. We can define a 1-from connection as

$$A^{(1)} \; = \; dt\ \lambda(r,t) + dr\ B(r,t), \tag{11}$$

where the gauge potential component $B(r,t)$ would be connected (as we shall see later) with p_r in an explicit fashion. The curvature 2-from

$$dA^{(1)} \; = \; (dt \wedge dr)\ [\partial_t B(r,t) - \partial_r \lambda(r,t)], \tag{12}$$

would remain invariant under the gauge (or (anti-) BRST) transformation.

---

[2] Only in the framework of the superfield formulation [4,5], we shall take these coordinates as independent variables. Ultimately, however, we shall take the limit $r \to 0$ so that all the variables of the theory become function of the evolution parameter t only.

In the superfield approach to BRST formalism (see, e.g. [4,5]), the exterior derivative and 1-form connection are generalized to a supermanifold parametrized by r, t, η and $\bar\eta$ where η and $\bar\eta$ are Grassmannian variables (i.e. $\eta^2 = \bar\eta^2 = 0, \eta\bar\eta + \bar\eta\eta = 0$). Thus, on the above (2, 2)-dimensional supermanifold, we have the following expressions for the generalizations, namely;

$$\begin{array}{rcl} d \to \tilde d &=& dt\ \partial_t + dr\ \partial_r + d\eta\ \partial_\eta + d\bar\eta\ \partial_{\bar\eta}, \qquad \tilde d^2 = 0, \\ A^{(1)} \to \tilde A^{(1)} &=& dt\ \tilde\lambda(r,t,\eta,\bar\eta) + dr\ \tilde B(r,t,\eta,\bar\eta) \\ &+& d\eta\ \bar F(r,t,\eta,\bar\eta) + d\bar\eta\ F(r,t,\eta,\bar\eta), \end{array} \tag{13}$$

where $\partial_\eta = (\partial/\partial\eta), \partial_{\bar\eta} = (\partial/\partial\bar\eta)$ are the Grassmannian derivatives and the component superfields can be expanded along the Grassmannian directions as:

$$\begin{array}{l} \tilde\lambda(r,t,\eta,\bar\eta) = \lambda(r,t) + \eta\ \bar f_1(r,t) + \bar\eta\ f_1(r,t) + i\ \eta\ \bar\eta\ B_1(r,t), \\ \tilde B(r,t,\eta,\bar\eta) = B(r,t) + \eta\ \bar f_2(r,t) + \bar\eta\ f_2(r,t) + i\ \eta\ \bar\eta\ B_2(r,t), \\ F(r,t,\eta,\bar\eta) = C(r,t) + i\ \eta\ \bar b_1(r,t) + i\ \bar\eta\ b_1(r,t) + i\ \eta\ \bar\eta\ S(r,t), \\ \bar F(r,t,\eta,\bar\eta) = \bar C(r,t) + i\ \eta\ \bar b_2(r,t) + i\ \bar\eta\ b_2(r,t) + i\ \eta\ \bar\eta\ \bar S(r,t), \end{array} \tag{14}$$

where $(\bar C)C$ are the (anti-) ghost fields, $\bar f_1, f_1, \bar f_2, f_2, S, \bar S$ are the fermionic secondary fields and $B_1, B_2, b_1, \bar b_1, b_2, \bar b_2$ are the bosonic secondary fields that would be determined in terms of the basic fields by exploiting the so-called horizontality condition of the geometrical superfield formalism.

The celebrated horizontality condition requires that the gauge invariant curvature 2-form should remain independent of the Grassmannian variables η and $\bar\eta$. This can be expressed, in the mathematcal form, as

$$\tilde d \tilde A^{(1)} = dA^{(1)}. \tag{15}$$

The l.h.s. of the above condition can be explicitly expressed as

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \tilde d \tilde A^{(1)} &=& (dt \wedge dr)[\partial_t \tilde B - \partial_r \tilde\lambda] + (dt \wedge d\eta)[\partial_t \bar F - \partial_\eta \tilde\lambda] + (dt \wedge d\bar\eta)[\partial_t F - \partial_{\bar\eta} \tilde\lambda] \\ &+& (dr \wedge d\eta)[\partial_r \bar F - \partial_\eta \tilde B] + (dr \wedge d\bar\eta)[\partial_r F - \partial_{\bar\eta} \tilde B] - (d\eta \wedge d\eta)(\partial_\eta \bar F) \\ &-& (d\bar\eta \wedge d\bar\eta)(\partial_{\bar\eta} F) - (d\eta \wedge d\bar\eta)[\partial_\eta F + \partial_{\bar\eta} \bar F]. \end{array} \tag{16}$$

Ultimately, the horizontality condition (i.e. $\tilde d \tilde A^{(1)} = dA^{(1)}$) yields the following relationships between the basic and secondary fields:

$$\begin{array}{llll} b_1 = 0, & \bar b_2 = 0, & S = 0, & \bar S = 0, \\ \bar f_1 = \dot{\bar C}, & f_1 = \dot C, & B_1 = \dot b_2 = -\dot{\bar b}_1, & \bar f_2 = \partial_r \bar C, \\ f_2 = \partial_r C, & B_2 = \partial_r b_2 \equiv -\partial_r \bar b_1, & \bar b_1 + b_2 = 0. & \end{array} \tag{17}$$

The choice $b_2 = b = -\bar{b}_1$, yields the following explicit expressions

$$\begin{aligned}
&\tilde{\lambda}^{(R)}(r,t,\eta,\bar{\eta}) = \lambda(r,t) + \eta\,\dot{\bar{C}}(r,t) + \bar{\eta}\,\dot{C}(r,t) + i\,\eta\,\bar{\eta}\,\dot{b}(r,t),\\
&\tilde{B}^{(R)}(r,t,\eta,\bar{\eta}) = B(r,t) + \eta\,\partial_r\bar{C}(r,t) + \bar{\eta}\,\partial_r C(r,t) + i\,\eta\,\bar{\eta}\,\partial_r b(r,t),\\
&F^{(R)}(r,t,\eta,\bar{\eta}) = C(r,t) - i\,\eta\,b(r,t),\\
&\bar{F}^{(R)}(r,t,\eta,\bar{\eta}) = \bar{C}(r,t) + i\,\bar{\eta}\,b(r,t),
\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

where the superscript (R) denotes the reduced form of the expansions in (14). The stage is now set to make a judicious choice of $\tilde{B}^{(R)}(r,t,\eta,\bar{\eta})$ and $B(r,t)$ in terms of the gauge components $p_r(r,t)$. The following choices

$$\tilde{B}^{(R)}(r,t,\eta,\bar{\eta}) = \partial_r\tilde{p}_r^{(R)}(r,t,\eta,\bar{\eta}), \qquad B(r,t) = \partial_r p_r(r,t), \tag{19}$$

lead to the following expansion for the super dynamical field:

$$\tilde{p}_r^{(R)}(r,t,\eta,\bar{\eta}) = p_r(r,t) + \eta\,\bar{C}(r,t) + \bar{\eta}\,C(r,t) + i\,\eta\,\bar{\eta}\,b(r,t). \tag{20}$$

It is clear from the beginning that all the variables of our present toy model are function of the evolution parameter t only. Thus, at this juncture, we take the limit $r \to 0$, so that we obtain the following correct physical expansion (corresponding to (18)) for the super dynamical variables, namely;

$$\begin{aligned}
&\tilde{\lambda}^{(h)}(t,\eta,\bar{\eta}) = \lambda(t) + \eta\,\dot{\bar{C}}(t) + \bar{\eta}\,\dot{C}(t) + i\,\eta\,\bar{\eta}\,\dot{b}(t),\\
&\tilde{p}_r^{(h)}(t,\eta,\bar{\eta}) = p_r(t) + \eta\,\bar{C}(t) + \bar{\eta}\,C(t) + i\,\eta\,\bar{\eta}\,b(t),\\
&F^{(h)}(t,\eta,\bar{\eta}) = C(t) - i\,\eta\,b(t),\\
&\bar{F}^{(h)}(t,\eta,\bar{\eta}) = \bar{C}(t) + i\,\bar{\eta}\,b(t),
\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

where the superscript (h) denotes the superfield expansions after the application of the HC. In terms of the (anti-) BRST symmetry transformations (cf. (5), (6)), we have the following uniform expansions

$$\begin{aligned}
&\tilde{\lambda}^{(h)}(t,\eta,\bar{\eta}) = \lambda + \eta\,(s_{ab}\,\lambda) + \bar{\eta}\,(s_b\,\lambda) + \eta\,\bar{\eta}\,(s_b\,s_{ab}\,\lambda),\\
&\tilde{p}_r^{(h)}(t,\eta,\bar{\eta}) = p_r + \eta\,(s_{ab}\,p_r) + \bar{\eta}\,(s_b\,p_r) + \eta\,\bar{\eta}\,(s_b\,s_{ab}\,p_r),\\
&F^{(h)}(t,\eta,\bar{\eta}) = C + \eta\,(s_{ab}\,C) + \bar{\eta}\,(s_b\,C) + \eta\,\bar{\eta}\,(s_b\,s_{ab}\,C),\\
&\bar{F}^{(h)}(t,\eta,\bar{\eta}) = \bar{C} + \eta\,(s_{ab}\,\bar{C}) + \bar{\eta}\,(s_b\,\bar{C}) + \eta\,\bar{\eta}\,(s_b\,s_{ab}\,\bar{C}),
\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

where we have taken into account the nilpotent symmetry transformations $s_bC = 0,\ s_{ab}\bar{C} = 0,\ s_bs_{ab}C = s_b(-ib) = 0,\ s_bs_{ab}\bar{C} = 0$.

This establishes the non-trivial (anti-) BRST symmetry transformations of the dynamical variables of the theory. The trivial transformations $s_{(a)b}r = 0,\ s_{(a)b}\theta = 0,\ s_{(a)b}p_\theta = 0$ can also be derived by exploiting the augmented superfield formulation [11-14] in which, in addition to the HC, the gauge (BRST) invariant quantities, too, are required to be independent of the Grassmannian variables. In other words, we demand the following[3]

$$\tilde{r}(t,\eta,\bar{\eta}) = r(t), \qquad \tilde{\theta}(t,\eta,\bar{\eta}) = \theta(t), \qquad \tilde{p}_\theta(t,\eta,\bar{\eta}) = p_\theta(t), \tag{23}$$

where we have exploited the fact that the gauge invariant (physical) quantities are unaffected by the presence of the Grassmannian variables within the framework of the augmented superfield formalism [11-14]. The following explicit expansions along the Grassmannian directions

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{r}(t,\eta,\bar{\eta}) &= r(t) + \eta\, \bar{F}_1(t) + \bar{\eta}\, F_1(t) + i\, \eta\, \bar{\eta}\, q_1(t),\\
\tilde{p}_\theta(t,\eta,\bar{\eta}) &= p_\theta(t) + \eta\, \bar{F}_2(t) + \bar{\eta}\, F_2(t) + i\, \eta\, \bar{\eta}\, q_2(t),\\
\tilde{\theta}(t,\eta,\bar{\eta}) &= \theta(t) + \eta\, \bar{F}_3(t) + \bar{\eta}\, F_3(t) + i\, \eta\, \bar{\eta}\, q_3(t),
\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

and their subsequent substitution in (23) implies that all the secondary variables of the above expansion are zero, namely;

$$F_1 = \bar{F}_1 = F_2 = \bar{F}_2 = F_3 = \bar{F}_3 = q_1 = q_2 = q_3 = 0. \tag{25}$$

The above relationships, ultimately, imply the following uniform expansions

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{r}(t,\eta,\bar{\eta}) &= r(t) + \eta\, (s_{ab}\, r) + \bar{\eta}\, (s_b\, r) + \eta\, \bar{\eta}\, (s_b\, s_{ab}\, r),\\
\tilde{p}_\theta(t,\eta,\bar{\eta}) &= p_\theta(t) + \eta\, (s_{ab}\, p_\theta) + \bar{\eta}\, (s_b\, p_\theta) + \eta\, \bar{\eta}\, (s_b\, s_{ab}\, p_\theta),\\
\tilde{\theta}(t,\eta,\bar{\eta}) &= \theta(t) + \eta\, (s_{ab}\, \theta) + \bar{\eta}\, (s_b\, \theta) + \eta\, \bar{\eta}\, (s_b\, s_{ab}\, \theta).
\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

The above expansions, finally, lead to $s_{(a)b}\, r = s_{(a)b}\, \theta = s_{(a)b}\, p_\theta = 0$. Thus, the trivial (anti-) BRST symmetry transformations can also be captured within the framework of augmented superfield formalism [11-14]. In our Appendix, we provide the geometrical interpretations of the (anti-) BRST symmetries (and their corresponding generators) in the language of the translational generators along the Grassmannian directions of the (1, 2)-dimensional supermanifold. Furthermore, we also discuss about the nilpotency and anticommutativity properties within the framework of superfield formalism.

3. (Anti-) co-BRST symmetries: Lagrangian formalism

The gauge-fixing term $(\dot{\lambda} - p_r)$ has its origin in the co-exterior derivative $\delta = \pm * d *$ where $*$ is the Hodge duality operation on a given manifold. This can be partially understood by taking into account $\delta = *\, d\, *$, $d = dt\ \partial_t$ and 1-form $A^{(1)} = dt\ (\lambda(t))$ on a one-dimensional manifold parametrized by a single parameter t. For instance, it can be checked that

---

[3] All the super dynamical variables, unlike in the context of the HC, would now be taken to be function of the (1, 2)-dimensional superspace variables $t, \eta, \bar{\eta}$ only.

$$\delta A^{(1)} = *\, d\, * \big(dt \lambda(t)\big) = \dot{\lambda}(t), \qquad *\,(dt) = 1. \tag{27}$$

Thus, the term $\dot{\lambda}$, in the total gauge-fixing term $(\dot{\lambda} - p_r)$, has its origin in the exterior derivative δ. It should be noted that we have not discussed anything about p_r because it has completely different behavior under the gauge (or (anti-) BRST) symmetry transformations (cf. (2),(5),(6)).

The following nilpotent ($s^2_{(a)d} = 0$) and absolutely anticommuting ($s_d s_{ad} + s_{ad} s_d = 0$) local infinitesimal transformations $s_{(a)d}$

$$\begin{array}{llll}
s_{ad}\, \lambda = C, & s_{ad}\, C = 0, & s_{ad}\, p_r = \dot{C}, & s_{ad}\, \bar{C} = -i\, (r - a), \\
s_{ad}\, b = 0, & s_{ad}\, r = s_{ad}\, \theta = s_{ad}\, p_\theta = 0, & & s_{ad}\, (\dot{\lambda} - p_r) = 0, \\
s_d\, \lambda = \bar{C}, & s_d\, \bar{C} = 0, & s_d\, p_r = \dot{\bar{C}}, & s_d\, C = i\, (r - a), \\
s_d\, b = 0, & s_d\, r = s_d\, \theta = s_d\, p_\theta = 0, & & s_d\, (\dot{\lambda} - p_r) = 0,
\end{array} \tag{28}$$

leave the gauge-fixing term invariant[4]. As a consequence, we christen them as the (anti-) dual BRST symmetry transformations. It is straightforward to check that the FOL (4) remains absolutely invariant under (28) because

$$s_{(a)d}\, L_b = 0. \tag{29}$$

Thus, the transformations, listed in (28), are the perfect symmetry transformations for the first-order BRST invariant Lagrangian (4).

It can be readily checked that the following conserved charges (that are derived by exploiting the Noether's theorem), namely;

$$Q_d = b\, \bar{C} - \dot{b}\, \dot{\bar{C}}, \qquad Q_{ad} = b\, C - \dot{b}\, \dot{C}, \tag{30}$$

are the generators of the transformations (28) because

$$s_r \Psi = -i\, [\Psi,\ Q_r]_{(\pm)}, \qquad r = d, ad, \tag{31}$$

where the subscripts $(\pm)$ on the square bracket correspond to the (anti-) commutator for Ψ being (fermionic) bosonic in nature. It is straightforward to check that the following relationships are true, namely;

$$\begin{array}{ll}
s_d Q_d = -i\{Q_d, Q_d\} = 0, & s_{ad} Q_{ad} = -i\{Q_{ad}, Q_{ad}\} = 0, \\
s_d Q_{ad} = -i\{Q_{ad}, Q_d\} = 0, & s_{ad} Q_d = -i\{Q_d, Q_{ad}\} = 0,
\end{array} \tag{32}$$

---

[4] We came to know about these transformations from an oral presentation by S. K. Rai much before his article appeared on the internet (S. K. Rai, B. P. Mandal, *arXiv:1001.5388 [hep-th]*). We differ drastically, however, from their interpretation of the dual-BRST symmetry transformations as well as their corroborative logic behind its existence.

which are basically the reflection of the nilpotency and anticommutativity property of $s_{(a)d}$ (i.e. $s^2_{(a)d} = 0$ and $s_d s_{ad} + s_{ad} s_d = 0$). The absolute anticommutativity of s_d and s_{ad}, however, imply that only one of them could be identified with the co-exterior derivative of the differential geometry.

We wrap up this section with the comment that the physicality condition $Q_{(a)d}|phys >= 0$ leads to the requirement that $b|phys >= 0$ and $\dot{b}|phys >= 0$. These conditions, due to equations (8) and (9), imply that the operator form of the first-class constraints $\Pi_\lambda \approx 0$ and $(r - a) \approx 0$ annihilate the physical states of the theory. Thus, the physicality criteria $Q_{(a)d}|phys >= 0$ is consistent with the Dirac's method of quantization (see, e.g. [3] for details). It is very interesting to point out that, for the present toy model, the (anti-) BRST and (anti-) co-BRST charges lead to the *same conditions* on the physical states due to the requirement of the physicality criteria $(Q_{(a)b}\ |phys >= 0, Q_{(a)d}\ |phys >= 0)$ in the total quantum Hilbert space of states (that are consistent with the Dirac's method of quantization).

4. Bosonic symmetry: Lagrangian approach

It is elementary to check that the following four anticommutators

$$\{s_d, s_{ad}\} = 0, \quad \{s_b, s_{ab}\} = 0, \quad \{s_b, s_{ad}\} = 0, \quad \{s_d, s_{ab}\} = 0, \tag{33}$$

are absolutely zero because when they act on any arbitrary dynamical (and/or auxiliary) variable of the theory, they produce zero result. The other two anticommutators, constructed from the four nilpotent $(s^2_{(a)b} = 0, s^2_{(a)d} = 0)$ operators $s_{(a)b}$ and $s_{(a)d}$, are found to be non-zero. These are as follows

$$\{s_b, s_d\} = s_\omega, \qquad \{s_{ab}, s_{ad}\} = s_{\bar{\omega}}. \tag{34}$$

The above anticommutators lead to the definition of a unique bosonic symmetry in the theory. To elucidate this point, let us first express the transformations, generated by s_ω, as

$$\begin{aligned} s_\omega \lambda = i\ (b + \dot{r}), \qquad s_\omega p_r = i\ (\dot{b} + r - a), \\ s_\omega C = s_\omega \bar{C} = s_\omega r = s_\omega \theta = s_\omega p_\theta = s_\omega b = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

These are symmetry transformations because the FOL remains quasi-invariant as can be seen from the following explicit expression:

$$s_\omega L_b \ = \ \frac{d}{dt} \Big[i\ (b\dot{r} - 2ra + r^2) \Big]. \tag{36}$$

The action $S = \int dt\ L_b$, as a consequence, remains invariant if all the variables of the theory are assumed to fall off rapidly at infinity.

The other anticommutator $\{s_{ad}, s_{ab}\}$ does not lead to an independent bosonic symmetry transformation as is evident from the following expression for the transformations $s_{\bar{\omega}}$, namely;

$$\begin{aligned} s_{\bar{\omega}}\, \lambda \;&=\; -i\; (b + \dot{r}), \qquad s_{\bar{\omega}}\, p_r \;=\; -i\; (\dot{b} + r - a), \\ s_{\bar{\omega}}\, C \;=\; s_{\bar{\omega}}\, \bar{C} \;&=\; s_{\bar{\omega}}\, r \;=\; s_{\bar{\omega}}\, \theta \;=\; s_{\bar{\omega}}\, p_\theta \;=\; s_{\bar{\omega}}\, b \;=\; 0, \end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

which imply that $s_\omega + s_{\bar{\omega}} = 0$. As a result we have the following algebra

$$\{s_b, s_d\} \;=\; s_\omega \;=\; -\;\{s_{ad}, s_{ab}\}, \tag{38}$$

which demonstrates that s_ω is the analogue of the Laplacian operator of differential geometry. This bosonic symmetry leads to the following expression for the conserved charge due to the Noether's theorem:

$$Q_\omega \;=\; i\; [b^2 + 2ra - r^2]. \tag{39}$$

Using the equations of motion (8), it can be readily checked that

$$\frac{dQ_\omega}{dt} = i\; \left[2b\dot{b} + 2\dot{r}a - 2\dot{r}r\;\right] =\; 0. \tag{40}$$

The above conserved charge is the generator of the transformation s_ω. One of the decisive features of the bosonic symmetry is that the (anti-) ghost variables of the theory remain unchanged under this transformation.

5. Ghost symmetry: Lagrangian formulation

The ghost number of the (anti-) ghost fields $(\bar{C})C$ are $(-1)1$ and the rest of the variables of the theory have ghost number equal to zero. Thus, we have the following changes of the variables under the ghost-scale transformation:

$$\begin{aligned} &r \to r, \qquad \theta \to \theta, \qquad p_r \to p_r, \qquad p_\theta \to p_\theta, \\ &\lambda \to \lambda, \quad b \to b, \quad C \to e^{\Lambda} C, \quad \bar{C} \to e^{-\Lambda} \bar{C}, \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

where Λ is a global scale parameter. The infinitesimal version of the above transformations (i.e. $s_g C = C$, $s_g \bar{C} = -\bar{C}$, $s_g \Phi = 0$, $\Phi = r,\ \theta,\ p_r,\ p_\theta,\ b,\ \lambda$, etc.) lead to the definition of the following conserved charge

$$Q_g = -i\; (\dot{\bar{C}}\; C + \dot{C}\; \bar{C}). \tag{42}$$

Using equations of motion, it is pretty easy to prove that $\dot{Q}_g = 0$. This conserved ghost charge, in other words, is the generator of the infinitesimal version of the continuous symmetry transformations (41).

In addition to the above continuous symmetry transformation, the ghost sector respects the following discrete symmetry transformations

$$C \to \pm\, i\, \bar{C}, \qquad \bar{C} \to \pm\, i\, C. \tag{43}$$

The above discrete symmetry transformation is useful in enabling us to obtain the anti-BRST symmetry transformations from the BRST and *vice-versa*. Furthermore, the above transformations lead to similar kind of relationships between the co-BRST and the anti-co-BRST symmetry transformations.

We sum up this section with the comment that the (anti-) ghost variables are decoupled from the rest of the variables of the theory. These variables are unphysical. As a consequence, the conserved ghost charge does *not* put any restriction on the physical state of the theory. However, the ghost charge does define the ghost number of a given state and it plays a major role in establishing connection between the BRST cohomology and cohomology of the differential forms. This aspect, we discuss in our next section.

6. Cohomological aspects: algebraic structures

In this section, we shall establish connection between the conserved charges (and the continuous symmetry they generate) and the de Rham cohomological operators. In particular, we shall lay emphasis on the algebraic similarities between the conserved charges and cohomological operators.

6.1 Differential operators and charges

It is clear from (9) that all the dynamical variables of the theory have their corresponding momenta. Thus, the canonical brackets are ($\hbar = c = 1$)

$$\begin{aligned}
&[r,\ p_r] = i, \qquad [\theta,\ p_\theta] = i, \qquad [\lambda,\ b] = i, \\
&\{C,\ \dot{\bar{C}}\} = 1, \qquad \{\bar{C},\ \dot{C}\} = -1,
\end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

and all the rest of brackets are zero. Using these brackets, it can be checked that the following algebra is satisfied amongst the conserved charges:

$$\begin{aligned}
&Q^2_{(a)b} = 0, \qquad Q^2_{(a)d} = 0, \qquad \{Q_b, Q_{ab}\} = 0, \qquad \{Q_d, Q_{ad}\} = 0, \\
&\{Q_b, Q_{ad}\} = 0, \qquad \{Q_d, Q_{ab}\} = 0, \qquad i\,[Q_g, Q_b] = Q_b, \\
&i\,[Q_g, Q_{ad}] = Q_{ad}, \quad i\,[Q_g, Q_{ab}] = -Q_{ab}, \quad i\,[Q_g, Q_d] = -Q_d, \\
&[Q_\omega, Q_r] = 0, \qquad r = b,\ ab,\ d,\ ad,\ g.
\end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

This algebra is reminiscent of the algebra satisfied by the de Rham cohomological operators of differential geometry. These operators, to be precise, are nothing but the exterior derivative d (with $d^2 = 0$), the co-exterior derivative $\delta = \pm * d *$ (with $\delta^2 = 0$) and the Laplacian operator $\Delta = (d + \delta)^2 = d\delta + \delta d$. Here $*$ is the Hodge duality operation on a given spacetime manifold, on which, the above cohomological operators are defined[5].

In explicit form, the algebra obeyed by the above de Rham cohomological operators of differential geometry are as follows

$$\begin{array}{c} d^2 = \delta^2 = 0, \quad \Delta = (d + \delta)^2 = d\delta + \delta d \equiv \{d, \delta\}, \\ [\Delta, \delta] = 0, \qquad [\Delta, d] = 0. \end{array} \tag{46}$$

Comparing (45) and (46), we obtain following mappings

$$(Q_b, Q_{ad}) \to d, \quad (Q_d, Q_{ab}) \to \delta, \quad Q_\omega = \{Q_d, Q_b\} = -\{Q_{ad}, Q_{ab}\} = \Delta, \tag{47}$$

which shows that there is two-to-one mapping between the conserved charges on one hand and the cohomological operators on the other. Thus, our present model of rigid rotor provides a toy model for the Hodge theory.

It is well-known that d raises the degree of a n-form f_n by one when it acts on it (i.e. $df_n \sim f_{n+1}$). On the other hand, the operator δ lowers the degree of a n-form by one when it operates on it (i.e. $\delta f_n \sim f_{n-1}$). The action of the Laplacian operators, however, on a n-form f_n keeps the degree intact (i.e. $\Delta f_n \sim f_n$). These properties are traded with the ghost number of a state when we consider the full BRST-cohomology with all the conserved charges. We discuss below this analogy in a concise manner.

Let n be the ghost number of a state $\mid \psi >_n$ (defined in terms of the ghost charge Q_g) in the total Hilbert space of states, i.e.,

$$i\, Q_g \mid \psi >_n = \; n \mid \psi >_n, \tag{48}$$

then, the following relationships emerge due to the algebra (45), namely;

$$\begin{array}{l} i\, Q_g\, Q_b \mid \psi >_n = \; (n + 1)\, Q_b \mid \psi >_n, \\ i\, Q_g\, Q_{ad} \mid \psi >_n = \; (n + 1)\, Q_{ad} \mid \psi >_n, \\ i\, Q_g\, Q_d \mid \psi >_n = \; (n - 1)\, Q_d \mid \psi >_n, \\ i\, Q_g\, Q_{ab} \mid \psi >_n = \; (n - 1)\, Q_{ab} \mid \psi >_n, \\ i\, Q_g\, Q_\omega \mid \psi >_n = \; n\, Q_\omega \mid \psi >_n\, . \end{array} \tag{49}$$

---

[5] Using directly the symmetry transformations (5), (6), (28), (35) and (41) it can be checked that, in the operator form, they obey the algebra: $s^2_{(a)b} = 0$, $s^2_{(a)d} = 0$, $\{s_b, s_{ab}\} = 0$, $\{s_d, s_{ad}\} = 0$, $\{s_b, s_{ad}\} = 0$, $\{s_d, s_{ab}\} = 0$, $i\, [s_g, s_b] = s_b$, $i\, [s_g, s_{ad}] = s_{ad}$, $i\, [s_g, s_{ab}] = -s_{ab}$, $i\, [s_g, s_d] = -s_d$, $[s_\omega, s_r] = 0$, $r = b,\ ab,\ d,\ ad,\ g$. Thus, the above symmetry operators also obey the algebra of (45) and (46). Hence, they also provide a physical realization of the algebra obeyed by the cohomological operators of differential geometry.

The above equations demonstrate that the ghost number of $Q_b| \psi >_n$ is $(n+1)$, that of $Q_d| \psi >_n$ is $(n-1)$ and the state $Q_\omega| \psi >_n$ has the ghost number n, respectively. Thus, (Q_b, Q_d, Q_ω) form one set that is an analogue of (d, δ, Δ). Moreover, in an exactly similar fashion, it can be checked that the other set $(Q_{ad}, Q_{ab}, Q_\omega)$ also obeys the same algebra as (d, δ, Δ). Hence, this set also constitutes an analogue of the above cohomological operators.

We wrap up this subsection with the conclusion that our present model of rigid rotor provides a toy model for the Hodge theory where the de Rham cohomological operators are identified with the Noether's conserved charges (and the continuous symmetry transformations they generate). As a consequence, this toy model presents one of the simplest examples in physics that provides a meeting-ground for some aspects of differential geometry in mathematics and a few key concepts of symmetries in theoretical physics.

6.2 Hodge decomposition theorem and conserved charges

On a compact manifold without a boundary, it is well-known that an arbitrary n-form f_n can be written as a unique sum of a harmonic form h_n (i.e. $\Delta h_n = 0 \Rightarrow dh_n = 0, \delta h_n = 0$), an exact form (de_{n-1}) and a co-exact form (δc_{n+1}) due to the celebrated Hodge decomposition theorem as [15-17]

$$f_n = h_n + d\, e_{n-1} + \delta\, c_{n+1}. \tag{50}$$

The above decomposition can be expressed in the quantum Hilbert space of states in the following fashion (cf. (47))

$$| \psi >_n = \; | \omega >_n \; + Q_b \mid \chi >_{n-1} \; + Q_d \mid \phi >_{n+1}, \tag{51}$$

in terms of the set (Q_b, Q_d, Q_ω) because $Q_\omega |\omega >_n = 0$ implies $Q_b |\omega >_n = 0$ and $Q_d |\omega >_n = 0$. The above equation (51) can also be expressed in terms of the set $\big(Q_{ad}, Q_{ab}, Q_\omega\big)$ as follows (cf. (47))

$$| \psi >_n = \; | \omega >_n \; + Q_{ad} \mid \chi >_{n-1} \; + Q_{ab} \mid \phi >_{n+1}, \tag{52}$$

where the most symmetric state is the harmonic state $\mid \omega >_n$ that satisfies:

$$Q_\omega \mid \omega >_n = \; 0, \quad Q_{(a)b} \mid \omega >_n = \; 0, \quad Q_{(a)d} \mid \omega >_n = \; 0. \tag{53}$$

In other words, a harmonic state is annihilated by (anti-) BRST as well as (anti-) co-BRST charges *together*. Thus, for aesthetic reasons, it can be chosen as the physical state because it is the most symmetric state.

It is quite interesting to point out that all the fermionic charges $(Q_{(a)b}, Q_{(a)d})$, due to the following physicality criteria on the physical states, namely;

$$Q_{(a)b} \mid phys >= 0, \quad Q_{(a)d} \mid phys >= 0, \quad |phys >= |\text{harmonic state} >, \tag{54}$$

lead to the following conditions (cf. (8),(9))

$$\begin{aligned} b \mid phys > =& \; 0 \Rightarrow \Pi_\lambda \mid phys >= 0, \\ \dot{b} \mid phys > =& \; 0 \Rightarrow (r - a) \mid phys >= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

It is a completely new observation that the full set of all the conserved charges ($Q_{(a)b},\ Q_{(a)d},\ Q_\omega$) of the toy model of the rigid rotor lead to the same restrictions on the physical state due to the physicality criteria (54). This is true only for the present (very special) toy model. We note that the operator form of the first-class constraint annihilates the physical state as a consequence of the above physicality criteria. This outcome is consistent with the Dirac's method of quantization of a system with first-class constraints.

7. Conclusions

In our present investigation, we have demonstrated that a toy model of the rigid rotor, endowed with the first-class constraints in the language of Dirac's prescription for classification scheme [2,3], is not only a model for the gauge theory but its (anti-) BRST invariant version respects a set of six continuous symmetry transformations which, in turn, render this theory to be a tractable toy model for the Hodge theory. As a consequence, the above symmetry transformations provide a physical realization of the de Rham cohomological operators of differential geometry as far as the algebra is concerned.

The BRST symmetry transformation turns out to be the analogue of the exterior derivative because the kinetic term, owing its origin to the exterior derivative, remains invariant under it. In a similar fashion, under the dual(co)-BRST symmetry transformations, it is the gauge-fixing term (owing partially its origin to the co-exterior derivative) that remains unchanged. Thus, the co-BRST symmetry transformation is the analogue of the co-exterior derivative. The anticommutator of the above two nilpotent symmetries results in a bosonic symmetry in the theory which turns out to be the analogue of the Laplacian operator. The ghost terms of the theory remain invariant under the latter (non-nilpotent) bosonic symmetry transformation.

At the algebraic level, we note that there is two-to-one mapping between the conserved charges of the theory and the de Rham cohomological operators (cf. (47)). As a consequence, in the total quantum Hilbert space of states, there are two ways to express the Hodge decomposition theorem. The most symmetric state (i.e. the harmonic state) has been chosen, in our present investigation, as the physical state of the theory. This state, by its very definition, is annihilated by the four fermionic (i.e. $Q^2_{(a)b} = 0, Q^2_{(a)d} = 0$) charges and a bosonic charge (Q_ω) that corresponds to the Laplacian operator.

The physical consequence, that emerges from the restrictions on the harmonic state with all the conserved charges is, however, one and the same. In explicit physical terms, this implies that the physical state (identified with the harmonic state) is annihilated by the operator form of the first-class constraints of the theory (cf. (55)). This observation is, however, true only for the present toy model of the rigid rotor. In the case of the 2D (non-)Abelian 1-form and 4D Abelian 2-form theories, the restrictions that emerge from the BRST and dual-BRST charges are different. They are, however, connected by a duality transformation that is present in these theories (see, e.g. [11-14]). This is not the case in our present toy model as there is no duality in the $(0 + 1)$-dimensional toy model of the rigid rotor.

In our present model, the analogues of the components of the "gauge" potential are λ and p_r. They transform, however, in a drastically different manner under the gauge and (anti-) BRST symmetry transformations (cf. (2),(5),(6)). The superfield approach to BRST formalism (see, e.g. [4,5,11-14]) provides the usual (anti-) BRST symmetry transformations connected with the usual gauge fields. Thus, it was a challenge for us to derive the nilpotent (anti-) BRST symmetry transformations for λ and p_r within the framework of geometrical superfield formalism. It is gratifying to note that we have accomplished this goal in our subsection 2.2 by exploiting the strength of the modified version of the HC where we have made some daring (but judicious) choices for the (super) fields (see, e.g. (19)). This result might turn out to be quite useful, later on, in more complex physical situations.

It is interesting to point out that, for the explicit application of the idea of HC, we have treated the parameters r and t as independent variables because, in our view, that is the only judicious option left for us to include both the components (i.e. λ, p_r) of the gauge potential *together*. Since the transformation properties of the components of the gauge potential are radically different (cf.(2),(5),(6)), the latter component (i.e. p_r) has been incorporated (cf. (11),(19)) in a hidden fashion (i.e. $B(r,t) = \partial_r p_r$) within the framework of superfield formalism and applicability of HC (cf. (15)). Later on, we set the limit $r \to 0$. To the best of our knowledge, our application of HC, in the context of the superfield approach to our toy model of rigid rotor, is a novel feature because its methodology is quite different from the usual [4,5,11-14].

Our present toy model is one of the simplest models in theoretical physics that represents a tractable model for the Hodge theory. It would be a nice future endeavor to look for other toy models (see, e.g. [18,19]) that could provide examples of the Hodge theory. In fact, such kind of studies have enabled us to prove that (i) the 2D free (non-)Abelian gauge theories present a new type of topological field theories (see, e.g. [6]), and (ii) the 4D free Abelian 2-form gauge theory is a model for the quasi-topological field theory (see, e.g. [20]). It would be challenging endeavor to look for the higher-form and higher-dimensional field theories to provide a set of tractable field theoretical models for the Hodge theory. To achieve the above goals, it might be useful to exploit the mathematical tools (related to the BRST formalism) that are developed in [21,22]. These issues are under investigation and our results would be reported in our future publications [23].

Acknowledgments

Financial support from DST, Government of India, under the SERC project sanction grant No: SR/S2/HEP-23/2006 is gratefully acknowledged.

Appendix

We discuss here some of the mathematical properties (e.g. nilpotency and anticommutativity) associated with the (anti-) BRST symmetry transformations (and their corresponding generators) in the language of the geometrical superfield formalism [4,5]. From the expansions (22) and (26), it is evident that we have the following relationships

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{\eta \to 0} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar\eta}\, \tilde\Omega^{(h)}\,(t, \eta, \bar\eta) = s_b\, \Omega(t), \quad \lim_{\bar\eta \to 0} \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta}\, \tilde\Omega^{(h)}\,(t, \eta, \bar\eta) = s_{ab}\, \Omega(t), \\
&\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar\eta}\, \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta}\, \tilde\Omega^{(h)}\,(t, \eta, \bar\eta) = s_b\, s_{ab}\, \Omega(t),
\end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

where $\tilde\Omega^{(h)}(t, \eta, \bar\eta)$ is the superfield corresponding to the generic dynamical variable $\Omega(t) \equiv r(t),\ \theta(t),\ p_r(t),\ p_\theta(t),\ \lambda(t),\ C(t),\ \bar C(t)$. The former superfields are obtained after the application of HC and additional restrictions (cf. (23)). Taking the definition of the generator of a symmetry transformation, it is evident that $s_r \Omega(t) = -i\ [\Omega(t), Q_r]_\pm\ (r = b, ab)$ and the $(+)-$ signs on the square bracket denote (anti-)commutator corresponding to the (fermionic) bosonic variable $\Omega(t)$. Thus, we have the following mathematical mappings amongst the various useful (but related) quantities, namely;

$$\begin{aligned}
&s_b \Longleftrightarrow \lim_{\eta \to 0} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar\eta} \Longleftrightarrow Q_b, \quad s_{ab} \Longleftrightarrow \lim_{\bar\eta \to 0} \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} \Longleftrightarrow Q_{ab}, \\
&s_b\, s_{ab} \Longleftrightarrow \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar\eta}\, \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} \Longleftrightarrow Q_b\, Q_{ab},
\end{aligned} \tag{57}$$

which provide the geometrical origin and interpretation for the nilpotent and anticommuting (anti-) BRST transformations (and their corresponding generators) as the translational operators (i.e. $\partial_\eta, \partial_{\bar\eta}$) along the Grassmannian directions of the (1, 2)-dimensional supermanifold [4,5].

Geometrically, a BRST symmetry transformation s_b (on a variable $\Omega(t)$) corresponds to the translation of the corresponding superfield $\Omega^{(h)}(t, \eta, \bar\eta)$ along the Grassmannian direction $\bar\eta$ (when there is no translation along the η-direction) of the (1, 2)-dimensional supermanifold (on which the present toy model is generalized). In a similar fashion, an anti-BRST symmetry transformation s_{ab} (on an ordinary variable) is equivalent to the translation of the corresponding superfield along η-direction of the (1, 2)-dimensional supermanifold (without any kind of translation along $\bar\eta$-direction). Two successive translations along any one of the two Grassmannian directions correspond to the nilpotency property present in the BRST formalism. Similarly, the anticommutativity property can be encapsulated in the statement that the *sum* of a translation of the superfield along η (followed by a translations along $\bar\eta$-direction) *and* a translation along $\bar\eta$ (followed by a translation along η-direction) results in *no* translation at all (i.e. $\partial_\eta \partial_{\bar\eta} + \partial_{\bar\eta} \partial_\eta = 0$).

It is quite interesting now to note that the (anti-) BRST charges can be written, in terms of the superfields, as

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{ab} &= i\,\frac{\partial}{\partial\bar\eta}\,\frac{\partial}{\partial\eta}\left[\bar F^{(h)}\,\tilde\lambda^{(h)}\right] \;\equiv\; i\int d\bar\eta\int d\eta\,\Big(\bar F^{(h)}\,\tilde\lambda^{(h)}\Big),\\ Q_b &= i\,\frac{\partial}{\partial\bar\eta}\,\frac{\partial}{\partial\eta}\left[F^{(h)}\,\tilde\lambda^{(h)}\right] \;\equiv\; i\int d\bar\eta\int d\eta\,\Big(F^{(h)}\,\tilde\lambda^{(h)}\Big), \end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

where superscript (h) denotes the superfields obtained after the application of HC (cf. (21), (22)). Written in terms of the nilpotent (anti-) BRST symmetry transformations (cf. (5), (6)), the above equations read as

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{ab} &= i\;s_b\;s_{ab}\;(\bar C\;\lambda) \;\equiv\; -i\;s_{ab}\;s_b\;(\bar C\;\lambda),\\ Q_b &= i\;s_b\;s_{ab}\;(C\;\lambda) \;\equiv\; -i\;s_{ab}\;s_b\;(C\;\lambda). \end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

This establishes the nilpotency and anticommutativity of the (anti-) BRST symmetries (and their corresponding generators) as is evident from the following useful relationships:

$$\begin{aligned} s_b\,Q_{ab} &= -i\,\{Q_{ab},\;Q_b\} = 0, \quad s_b\,Q_b = -i\,\{Q_b,\;Q_b\} = 0,\\ s_{ab}\,Q_{ab} &= -i\,\{Q_{ab},\;Q_{ab}\} = 0, \quad s_{ab}\,Q_b = -i\,\{Q_b,\;Q_{ab}\} = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

In the above, we have exploited the definition of the generator (cf., e.g. (31)) of a continuous symmetry transformation.

The above BRST charge Q_b can be expressed in two more different ways. These, expressed in terms of the (anti-) ghost and gauge superfields, are

$$\begin{aligned} Q_b &= -i \lim_{\eta \to 0} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar\eta} \Big[F^{(h)} \dot{\bar F}^{(h)} + i b \tilde\lambda^{(h)} \Big] \equiv -i \lim_{\eta \to 0} \int d\bar\eta \Big[F^{(h)} \dot{\bar F}^{(h)} + i b \tilde\lambda^{(h)} \Big], \\ Q_b &= i \, \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} \, \big(F^{(h)} \dot F^{(h)} \big) \equiv i \int d\eta \, \big(F^{(h)} \dot F^{(h)} \big), \end{aligned} \qquad (61)$$

which can be re-expressed in terms of the nilpotent (anti-) BRST symmetry transformations (cf. (5), (6)) as

$$Q_b = i \; s_{ab} \; (C \, \dot C), \qquad Q_b = -i \; s_b \; [C \, \dot{\bar C} + i \, b \, \lambda]. \qquad (62)$$

Once again, the nilpotency and anticommutativity properties become quite transparent from (61) and (62). Furthermore, it is clear that, for this simple toy model, the (anti-) BRST charges are BRST as well as anti-BRST invariant. This can be proven by exploiting the nilpotency $s_{(a)b}^2 = 0$ property.

In exactly similar fashion, the anti-BRST charge (Q_{ab}) can be expressed, in two different and distinct ways, as listed below:

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{ab} &= -i \, \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar\eta} \, \Big[\bar F^{(h)} \; \dot{\bar F}^{(h)} \Big] \equiv -i \; s_b \, \big(\bar C \, \dot{\bar C} \big), \\ Q_{ab} &= -i \, \lim_{\bar\eta \to 0} \, \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} \, \Big[\dot F^{(h)} \bar F^{(h)} + i \, b \, \tilde\lambda^{(h)} \Big] \equiv -i s_{ab} \, \big(\dot C \bar C + i b \lambda \big). \end{aligned} \qquad (63)$$

The above expressions can also be written in terms of the integrals over the Grassmannian variables as follows

$$Q_{ab} = -i \, \int d\bar\eta \, \Big[\bar F^{(h)} \; \dot{\bar F}^{(h)} \Big] \equiv -i \, \int d\eta \, \Big[\dot F^{(h)} \; \bar F^{(h)} + i \, b \, \tilde\lambda^{(h)} \Big]. \qquad (64)$$

In the above form, too, the nilpotency of the anti-BRST charge (Q_{ab}) and its anticommutativity property with the BRST charge (Q_b) become quite lucid.

We close this Appendix with the remark that there are alternative ways to express the nilpotent (anti-) BRST charges in the superfield formulation. It can be checked that, in equations (58), (61), (63) and (64), one can replace $\tilde\lambda^{(h)} \to \dot{\bar p}_r^{(h)}$ (cf. (21)) without changing the algebraic expressions. Furthermore, the nilpotency and anticommutatvity properties are encoded in the properties of the translational generators ∂_η and $\partial_{\bar\eta}$. For instance, it can be checked that the observations: $\partial_\eta Q_{(a)b} = 0$ and $\partial_{\bar\eta} Q_{(a)b} = 0$, imply the above two properties due to (56). Thus, the superfield formalism does provide the geometrical meaning of the nilpotency and anticommutativity properties.

References

[1] D. Nemeschansky, C. Preitschopf, M. Weinstein, Ann. Phys. (N. Y.) **183**, 226 (1988)

[2] P. A. M. Dirac, *Lectures on Quantum Mechanics, Belfer Graduate School of Science* (Yeshiva University Press, New York, 1964)

[3] K. Sundermeyer, *Constrained Dynamics. Lecture Notes in Physics*, vol. 169 (Springer, Berlin, 1982)

[4] L. Bonora, M. Tonin, Phys. Lett. B **98**, 48 (1981)

[5] L. Bonora, P. Pasti, M. Tonin, Nouvo Cim. A **63**, 353 (1981)

[6] R. P. Malik, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **34**, 4167 (2001), hep-th/0012085

[7] R. P. Malik, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **15**, 1685 (2000), hep-th/9808040

[8] Saurabh Gupta, R. P. Malik, Eur. Phys. J. C **58**, 517 (2008), arXiv:0807.2306 [hep-th]

[9] R. P. Malik, Notoph gauge theory as the Hodge theory, in *Proc. of the International Workshop on Supersymmetries and Quantum Symmetries (SQS'03)*, BLTP, JINR, Dubna, 24-29 July 2003, pp. 321-326, hep-th/0309245

[10] E. Harikumar, R. P. Malik, M. Sivakumar, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **33**, 7149 (2000), hep-th/0004145

[11] R. P. Malik, Phys. Lett. B **584**, 210 (2004), hep-th/0311001

[12] R. P. Malik, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **37**, 5261 (2004), hep-th/0311193

[13] R. P. Malik, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **39**, 10575 (2006), hep-th/0510164

[14] R. P. Malik, Eur. Phys. J. C **51**, 169 (2007), hep-th/0603049

[15] T. Eguchi, P. B. Gilkey, A. Hanson, Phys. Rep. **66**, 213 (1980)

[16] S. Mukhi, N. Mukunda, *Introduction to Topology, Differential Geometry and Group Theory for Physicists* (Wiley Eastern Private Ltd., New Delhi, 1990)

[17] J. W. van Holten, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 2863 (1990)

[18] C. Lieva, M. S. Plyushchay, Ann. Phys. **307**, 372 (2003)

[19] M. S. Plyushchay, Phys. Lett. B **248**, 107 (1990)

[20] R. P. Malik, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **36**, 5095 (2003), hep-th/0209136

[21] A. P. Isaev, S. O. Krivonos, O. Ogievetsky, arXiv: 0807.1820 [mathph]

[22] A. P. Isaev, S. O. Krivonos, O. Ogievetsky, J. Math. Phys. **49**, 073512 (2008)

[23] Saurabh Gupta, R. P. Malik, in preparation